

DEFENCE OF THE "APPEAL."

To the Preachers and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the New England and New Hampshire Conferences.

CHRISTIAN FRIENDS AND BRETHREN:

The publication of a paper, called "A Counter Appeal," which has been widely circulated throughout the New England States, and elsewhere, makes it our duty to lay before you the document upon which the remarks contained in that paper, are said to have been founded. We have before informed you, in the 25th No. of Zion's Herald, that the document against which this "Counter Appeal" has been published, was not originally designed for the public generally, but only for the preachers who were members of the same Conferences with ourselves. But now, as a few of our brethren whom we addressed in our Appeal, have felt it their duty to publish their protest against it, charging it with being "fraught with doctrines radically erroneous," and which "must produce confusion and deeply injurious" to the cause of God, we cannot say how we can, in justice to you and to the cause of truth, withhold the document upon which such remarks have been made, and accordingly we have presented it on the preceding pages for your candid and prayerful consideration.

We would now, dear Brethren, respectfully request of you a patient and impartial investigation, both of our "Appeal," and of the "Counter Appeal" which our brethren have sent out against it. We do most earnestly desire that the words of these two documents, may be read by every one into whose hands they may fall, from reading every part of them. We entreat you as you love the cause of truth and humanity, as you venerate the memory of Wesley, and as you love the Church of your choice, that you will give the Appeal on the preceding pages, a thorough reading, and that you will not neglect any thing which is said in the "Counter Appeal" against it. And now, also, that you will possess your souls in patience while we proceed to test the course of reasoning which has been pursued in the "Counter Appeal," the subject of Slavery, and its connection with the Church of God.

In the examination of a few sentiments put forth in this "Counter Appeal," we earnestly hope, that nothing which you may find in our remarks, may be interpreted into a want of respect, or love for those whose names you have seen attached to that paper; we differ from them in it, in our views of *slavery*, but even this difference of opinion, we trust, will turn to our mutual benefit; for they will certainly lay us and pray for the more of it. They talk in an angry and unbecomingly hostile manner, and under such a supposition, the more we, on our part, shall, by the grace of God, love and pray for them. Nor can we believe that the discussion of this question will be attended with any evil consequences to the Church of which we are members, or to the poor slaves, whom the great God has commanded us to *remember*, and whose cause he has made it our duty to *plead*. *Truth is our object*, and if we search for this treasure, in the use of the best means in our power, may we not reasonably hope, that the God of Truth will enlighten our minds and give us his blessing?

It is certainly very desirable, in the examination of the subject upon which we differ from our respected brethren, that our remarks should be directed, as far as possible, from every thing which does not directly relate to the question under consideration; and as we now furnish you with our "Appeal," which you will read for yourselves, we shall leave it for you to judge whether it is correct, and in time, for our brethren to say as they do in the very first sentence of their paper, that we had "made an attempt to disturb the harmony and prosperity of our Church," and you must judge, also, whether our "Appeal" was sent out, in a "tone of feeling forgetful of its own purposes, in the excitement of the moment," and whether there was "a discrepancy between the measures" we used, and "the end" at which we aimed, which presents a contrast nearly ludicrous.

We proceed to state

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE.

The question upon which we join issue with our brethren, is nothing more or less than this—*Is it a sin against God to hold property in the human species?* This is the question. And here we might inquire of our brethren, why they did not state this question, distinctly, when they entered their protest against us? Why do they take up the question which we anticipated from our views of this question, and bring it forward in their remarks, "as the most concise and explicit expression" of the point at issue? Let the reader turn to the place in the Appeal, numbered 1, and he will find our views of this question stated, in no very equivocal language, we believe, and where we say, "No man has, or can have a right to hold a fellow man for one moment in bondage as a piece of merchantable property;" and that "every American citizen who retains a fellow being in bondage, as a piece of property, and takes the price of his labor without his consent, is guilty of a crime which cannot be reconciled with the spirit of the Christian religion." We may find what Slavery is, by a reference to the laws of the slave States—"A slave is one who is in the power of his master, to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing but what must belong to his master."—*Louisiana Code, Art. 3.*

"Slaves shall be deemed, taken, reputed and adjudged to be chattel persons in the hands of their masters and possessors, to all intents and purposes whatsoever."—*Laws of S. Carolina.*

Now it must be observed, here, that the question at issue between us, is not about the *rights* of Slavery,—not whether one man may have a right to the labor of another, under certain circumstances, nor whether a man may not be deprived of his liberty who has committed a crime; nor yet again, whether a government may not have a right, under certain circumstances, to the services of its subjects; but the question is, *Has one human being a right to hold property in the person of another human being? Can man hold property in man, consistently with the spirit of the Christian religion?* We say, No! But our brethren take the affirmative of this question, and joining issue with us, answer *Yes!*

In noticing what our brethren are pleased to call the "Scripture argument," in relation to slaveholding, we regret to find that they have stumbled upon the very threshold of the subject. After quoting a part of two passages of Scripture, they come to the following conclusion—

"No man has a right to remove any providential evil upon himself, by imposing a still greater evil upon another."

And by this very simple rule, they prove that it must be right for one man to hold another in bondage as his property! It did not once occur to them, it seems, that such a statement of theirs would go for nothing, just nothing at all, when applied to the question at issue, till they had first proved that it is not a sin to hold property in man. But they proceed to say, "WHATSOEVER be the nature of the property, it is a sin to hold it, whether it be a right to hold property, or of life; if we love our neighbors as ourselves, we shall continue that endurance, rather than relieve ourselves by the infliction of still greater misery upon another." We readily confess, that we should have some very serious objection to this statement, even were it not a most palpable instance of *begging the question* at issue. But it takes for granted, that which our brethren have made known it belonged to them to prove, before they founded a course of reasoning upon it.

1. That when one man takes away the property of another, it is no sin against God, in him who takes away, or withholds his neighbor's liberty. 2. That when an innocent man loses his liberty, in this way, it is an evil which is brought upon him by the providence, or the direct agency of God. And 3. That if every slaveholder in this nation were to cease holding property in his species, it would be attended with a greater amount of evil, than what is now produced by the slave system. But have they proved either of these particular propositions? Have they even proved the last? They rest upon it, state cases, and draw inferences; just as though it were a matter perfectly plain and already demonstrated! Nor is this the only singular fact which the reader must have observed in relation to this "Scripture argument;"—they are talking through the whole of it, about the duty of the slave, whereas the document against which they say they are entering their "protest," was designed to show the sin of *slaveholding*, and the duty of the master to let the oppressed go free!

So these brethren "materialize" their "Scripture argument" thus—"If any class of men," say they, "by any *disposition* of God, by birth, or otherwise, be placed in any circumstances of unhappiness of whatever kind, they are bound by the authority of the Golden Rule, to continue that state of unhappiness, so long as it can be removed only by imposing a still greater amount of unhappiness upon society at large;" and statements of a similar kind follow their train through one whole column of this "Counter Appeal." But without stopping to show how very inconclusive all such statements are, when applied to the point now under consideration, we will simply propose a question or two, and leave this part of the "Scripture argument," for the present, to the consideration of the reader. And

1. We would ask, who is to be the judge, as to the amount of misery which might be brought upon another, when one endeavors to rid himself of Slavery; the one who suffers the loss of his liberty, or he who withholds it from him? Or is a third person to be the judge, who looks on and sees the injury which is inflicted upon his neighbor? If you say that the sufferers should not be the

judges in the case, then it follows that the Poles, the Greeks, and the "patriots of our own revolution," sinned against God, in judging for themselves and acting accordingly; if you admit, as it seems these brethren do, in their illustration of the argument, that the sufferers should be the judges in the case, then it follows that all the slaves in this nation, might rise and butcher their masters to-day, provided they thought such a deed would be a "less evil" than the one which they are now suffering.

But if you say that the masters must be the judges in the case, then it follows that when another man is the cause of your "losing your property, your health, your liberty or life," he must be the only judge in the case, whether he has done wrong or not. Or, lastly, if you say that a third person must be the judge, that is, one who neither inflicts or suffers the evil, then it follows, that the efforts of the abolitionists of the present day, are justifiable in the sight of God, for they act upon this very conviction, that the immediate abolition of slaveholding, (that is, holding property in the human species,) would be a much less evil, than the continuance of the slave system.

2. But we would inquire, in the next place, how long it is since our brethren, who have signed the "Counter Appeal," embraced the notion, that "whatever be the nature of any evil," which any part of the human family suffer, it is "imposed upon them" by the agency of God? We have been in the way of being "imposed upon" by no evil can be done by God, and the Discipline of our Church, which is just of human, and also for not viewing the Discipline to mean by this, that Slavery is a great moral evil; but this "Counter Appeal" gives us a new idea upon the subject; it was "imposed" upon us by the "PROVIDENCE OF GOD;" it came upon the nation by the "DISPENSATION OF GOD!" This is a "new divinity" for Methodist ministers to preach, and we hope for the honor of Wesley, that it did not originate at the seat of learning in a neighboring State, which bears his venerable name.

Our brethren seem to be ignorant of us, for saying "that no part of the system of Slavery, is just of human," and also for not bringing forward more passages from the Bible, in support of our views. But we, on our part, think we have much more reason to complain of them, for not noticing the arguments which we built upon those texts which we did introduce into our Appeal. Our object in that paper was not, as we distinctly stated, (see 1, in the Appeal) to "attempt a particular discussion of the principles of Slavery," nor to enter into a labored examination of the Scriptures on the subject; but it was to show, to the eyes of our brethren, that the British Conference, on the subject of slaveholding, and to show that the Discipline of our Church is opposed to it. And "here we are left to ask," why our brethren did not notice the arguments that we built upon the Scriptures which we did quote? Why did they not bring those "under their critical canvassing," which the reader will have seen in our Appeal, numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 11? Why do they pass them all over, without even attempting to confute them? Why was this examination" of our arguments "commenced, or why was it not in some measure completed?" Especially, why did they not notice the arguments of Wesley, numbered 25, and the reasoning of Judge Blackstone, by which they prove that "all slaveholding is inconsistent with any degree of natural justice?" Why did they pass over the arguments of Wesley, (26) which show "slaveholding to be utterly inconsistent with mercy?" Was "their random sermonizing upon a few comparative indecisive texts, intended to be passed upon the unsatisfactory reader, for a sifting of the Bible doctrines," and for a successful confutation of arguments which we used in our Appeal, but which they do not even honor with a passing notice, or mention in any way? If the reader will be at the pains to look at those passages in the Appeal numbered 30 and 31, he will find some language from Wesley, which our brethren could not have misunderstood, and if he has read the "Counter Appeal," he may conjecture why those arguments are passed over by our brethren in total silence.

And here we might conclude our review of what is called the "Scripture argument," in relation to our brethren, for reasons which have been already stated; but, as the arguments which we brought forward in our Appeal remain untouched, we might with the utmost propriety wait until those are answered, before we address more; but we will not dismiss the subject, or pass it over in such "honest despair," as it seems those have done, who have felt it their duty to protest against our Appeal.

When the authors of the "Counter Appeal" complained of us for saying that "No part of the system of slaveholding is just or humane," they have already stated, for us, as the arguments which we brought forward in our Appeal remain untouched, we might with the utmost propriety wait until those are answered, before we address more; but we will not dismiss the subject, or pass it over in such "honest despair," as it seems those have done, who have felt it their duty to protest against our Appeal.

THE SLAVE SYSTEM.

1. The system of American Slavery regards a certain class of the human species, as mere goods or chattels, "TO ALL INTENTS, CONSTRUCTIONS, AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER."
2. It does not allow to the slave the rights of his own reason and conscience.
3. It annihilates the family state; prevents the parents from obeying the command of God to rear their children in the discipline, or to fulfill the marriage rites, and prevents husbands and wives from obeying the commands of God with regard to each other.
4. It enjoins, or sanctions, promiscuous intercourse between the sexes, without the rites of marriage.
5. It holds all the religious privileges of the slave at the mere mercy of his master, whether that master be infidel, papist, or protestant.
6. It prevents the slave from obeying that command of God, which makes it the duty of all men to "Search the Scriptures."
7. It drives away from the slave, the God, intelligent creature, by forbidding, and preventing, all schools for "mental instruction."
8. It withholds the hire of the laborer.
9. It sanctions and covers the breach of the 8th commandment. It justifies the very same thing which our laws and the laws of nations punish as piracy, if committed on the coast of Africa, or on the high seas. It originates and justifies what the Bible calls "Man-stealing."
10. It denies to the slave that protection for his character, his health and life, which is enjoyed by the free man.

Here it must be observed, that what we have stated above, forms no part of what is generally called the "evils of slavery," or, in other words, the "abuses of the system;" but the above facts make up the very system itself, the very thing which we say is a sin against God, and against which our Appeal was designed to bear; and to prove that the above statements are correct, and not over-drawn in the least degree, we refer you to the laws of the Slave States.

It may be necessary here to correct an error into which our brethren have fallen, in supposing that we admit the sense which they give to the Greek word *doûlos*, rendered *servant* in our common version of the Bible; and hence they quote from Dr. Clarke, to prove, that "the word *doûlos*, which we translate *servant*, properly means, a slave; one who is the entire property of his master." But why did they not quote the whole of Dr. Clarke's definition of this word? Here it is: we will quote it in its entirety. "The word *doûlos*, in the Greek Testament, signifies a slave, or a bondman, yet it often implies a *servant* in general; or any one bound to another, either for a limited time, or for life."—*Note on Eph. vi. 5.*

The reader will here see, at once, the probable reason which kept the other part of Dr. Clarke's definition of this word from the "Counter Appeal;" for had our brethren given this to their readers, it would have utterly nullified and totally set aside the whole of their "critical canvassing" on every passage of Scripture which they have quoted on the question at issue! And we can hardly suppress our astonishment, that it did not once occur to them, while deliberating upon the subject, or while writing five columns of "scripture arguments," or at least when reading over the "Counter Appeal," as many times as it is reasonable to suppose they must have done, before putting their names to it, that not one of those passages of Scripture, which they have quoted,

"Strobel's Sketches of the Slave-laws," a work that ought to be read by every Christian in the land.

And we find this view of the subject very much confirmed, by a very ably written article in the No. of the Bib. Repository for Jan. 1833, from the pen of Mr. B. B. Edwards, on "Slavery in Ancient Greece." Mr. Edwards, in speaking of the word *doûlos*, as used by the writers in this country, and, in giving an account of slavery in Athens, as it is incidentally delineated by Demosthenes, he says:—"Slaves, as long as they were under the government of a master, were called *doûloi*, but after their freedom was granted them, they were named *doûlois*, as being like the former, a part of their master's estate, but not required to render small service, such as was required of the *doûlois* (resident strangers, or aliens) to whom, in some respects, they were inferior."—*Vide Pot. Gr. An. vol. i. p. 63—and Watson's Expos. on Rom. i. 1.*

Now, when we consider that the Attic Greek is substantially the language in which the New Testament was written, and that with but one exception, we believe, the apostles uniformly used the word *doûlos*, when speaking of the reciprocal duties of servants and their masters, it follows, if Potter and Mr. Edwards are correct, that the "specific directions" of the New Testament do not refer to "relation" between a master and his "chattel," or those whom he owned as a part of his estate, but to such a relation as does, and may properly enough, exist between servants and their masters, where the former are not held as the "entire property" of the latter; and yet, even if these directions did refer to such a relation between a master and his "chattel," they must inevitably have been understood as virtually condemning that relation, because they do forbid the things which this relation "sanctioned," allowed, and "enjoined upon the master," who held it

could be brought to bear upon the point at issue, till they had first proved that the "servants," of whom the apostles speak, were held as the absolute property of their masters.

The reader will recollect the case of the servant, or slave, mentioned in Matt. xviii. 23, who was so much in his master's debt, that he was compelled to be sold and payment to be made; nor need he be told how utterly impossible it would be for a servant who is the absolute property of his master, to get in debt to his owner;—this case, and others which might be named, prove the correctness of the definition above given of *doûlos*, that it often, if not always, when used in the New Testament, signifies a servant in general, or one bound for a limited time," to the service of another. Such a "relation" we believe is not sinful; and hence, if all slave-holding were to cease this moment throughout the world, there would still be the same need of the directions both to "masters" and "servants," which we find in the New Testament, and many other parts of the Bible.

We have stated our Appeal, (see 8.) "that Christianity does not alter the civil connection which one man may sustain to another, merely by his embracing it." On this statement our brethren remark as follows:—"The writer in this simple sentence concedes the whole question;" and even "more than we can accept." Perhaps not; let us see.

Does Christianity ALTER the civil connection which one man may sustain to another, merely by his embracing it? Christianity may *condemn* that relation, as true; but does the act of his embracing religion, disannul that relation, and destroy in view of the civil law? We think not. If our brethren can prove that it does, let them do so; let them state one case in point, and when they shall have done this, we will leave it to our readers to say who concedes the question at issue—as for ourselves, we are not quite ready to concede it yet, and with the reader's patience, we will proceed to assign some of our reasons.

We observe then,

1. That no authority can be drawn from the Old Testament, in favor of American Slavery. This will readily appear, if we consider the following facts.

1. The Hebrews held some in slavery for a limited period, by the special permission and direction of God; and this permission was given on the very same ground, that a Hebrew was permitted to kill a man who had murdered his friend, (Num. xxxv. 19.) and he might do this without the process of a trial. And upon the same ground, the Jews were permitted to commence and carry on exterminating wars against the idolatrous nations around them.—Hence, we suppose, it is as equally true for any man in this age of the world, to take away the liberty of his neighbor, or to withhold it from him in any way without an express permission from God, as it would be for one to kill the murderer of his friend now, without the forms of law. And so also, it would be just as right for this nation to commence a war of extermination against all the heathen on the American continent, as it is for the nation to tolerate the domestic slave-trade, or for any man in the nation to hold property in his species. Before one human being can justly hold another as property, he can justly hold the permission of Him who has said, "all souls are mine."

2. Two-thirds of all the servants in Israel were free at the end of six years; and the fifth year all were set free. There was no such thing as hereditary servitude among the Jews.

But American Slavery is perpetual, to the very last moment of the slave's earthly existence, and by law it is entailed upon all of his descendants to the latest posterity.

3. Jewish servitude was voluntary, except in those cases where it was the penalty of a crime, (Ex. xxi. 1, 2, 3.)

But American Slavery is involuntary. No one who is now a slave in this land, was ever consulted, before his liberty was taken away, whether he was a slave or not; and if he had been, he could not have given his master just and proper title to his body as his property. (See 25 in the Appeal.)

4. Under the Mosaic economy, servants might contend with their masters about their rights; and to despise the cause of such, was considered a heinous crime. (See Job xxxi. 13.)

But here, in this land of Christians, slaves can make no contracts of any kind, they can have no legal right to any property; all they have and are, belong to their masters.

5. The laws of Moses granted freedom to a servant who had been cruelly treated. (See Ex. xxi. 26, 27.)

But our Christian laws allow the master to punish his slave, as much as he desires, and afford the slave no redress; nay, if the slave makes any resistance, the laws expressly justify the master in putting him to death. In Kentucky, "any negro, mulatto, or Indian, bond or free, who shall at any time" even "lift his hand in opposition to any white person, shall receive THIRTY LASHES on his or her bare back, WELL LAID ON, by order of the justice." (How we wish our brethren, who have signed the "Counter Appeal," had informed us what "part of the system" of American Slavery, they consider "just and humane.")

6. Servants were carefully protected among the Jews, in their domestic relations; so that husbands and wives, parents and their children must not be separated. And in case the mother did not get her freedom as soon as her husband, the children remained with her; and her master was bound to receive him to service again, in case he chose to live with his wife and children.

But how is it in this land? Here, slaves are entirely unprotected in their social and domestic relations;—husbands and wives, parents and their children may be, and they are separated and parted forever, at the irresponsible will of the master, without any fault on the part of the slave.

7. The laws of Moses secured to servants, the necessary means of instruction and consolation.

But no such laws exist in this land; here the operation of the laws, tends directly to deprive the slaves of all "mental" and religious "instruction," for their whole power is exerted to keep slaves in the lowest kind of ignorance.

8. The laws of Moses require every one to pity and love the stranger who might chance to be among the Jews, and under severe penalties they were forbidden to vex or oppress him, in any way.

But how is it here, in this land of freedom, and light, and Sabbath, and Bibles, and Christians? Here the laws view every colored stranger as an enemy, and they consider him a slave, until he proves his freedom.

9. If a servant escaped from his master and fled to the land of Israel, the law of Moses commanded him to be protected; and he was to be delivered up to his master again.

But here, if a slave escape from his master, and flee to any part of the United States, the law forbids any one to protect him, and commands that he be delivered up to his master.

10. The Mosaic law forbade man-stealing as the highest kind of theft, and condemned the perpetrator to suffer death as a penalty.

But here, thousands of legally free people of color have been stolen, and sold into hopeless and involuntary servitude, as many as thirty every year, in this nation; and there is no law by which they can redress their wrongs.

Such, Christian reader, are some of the wide discrepancies, which may be noted between the servitude which was tolerated in the dark ages of the Mosaic economy, and the system of SLAVERY which is established by law in this land, and which is supported also by Christians and Christian ministers, and defended by the "Christian Scriptures!" But we remark,

1. That no authority can be drawn from any part of the New Testament, in favor of this system. We have already, we think, shown that the reasoning of our brethren, in both parts of what they call their "Scripture Argument" upon this question, is inconclusive; because in both cases, that is, in arguing from "the general spirit and tenor of the gospel," and from "the specific texts of the New Testament," they beg the question at issue.

But we have not yet done with the "Scripture argument;" as we are not quite ready to grant either of the various points for which our brethren beg so feelingly in this "Counter Appeal;" we have a few more reasons to offer against it;—let the reader weigh them.

1. Admitting, as our brethren attempt to prove in their argument, that the Apostles did mean to justify the "relation" which existed between master and slave, when that "relation" gave the master the body of the slave as his absolute property, then it follows as an undeniable consequence, that the "relation" which did mean to justify all his rights to the slave, as his property, entitled the master, by the right of this "relation," they justified and approved all the parts of which it was composed. Let us mention one or two of them, and see how they will look when compared with the teaching of Christ and his apostles:—

(1.) Masters could put their slaves to death at their pleasure, and they did do frequently, and with great cruelty. (2.) If a master was slain at his own house, and the murderer could not be found, all his domestic slaves were liable to be put to death; and him as "a chattel personal, in the hands of his master and possessor, to ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER," and at the same time it "fixes a stigma" upon this "relation,"—"*an unnatural, a libellous, a blasphemous, a profane, and a sacrilegious relation*," which will not avail upon a contradiction which must be so evident to every reader, nor will we stop to press it, as we know we might do, to the disadvantage of our brethren; it is sufficient for the reader to see, that the "whole question" at issue, is conceded in the above quotation; the slave laws, as we have shown, establish the "relation" between the master and the slave, which makes the slave in the very spirit, design, and language of his law, "a chattel," a mere article of property.

"TO ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER," and upon the "principle that man can," in the nature of things, be such an article of property, the brethren who have signed the

rights were derived; and we can see no way in which our brethren can fairly escape from this conclusion, unless they admit that the apostles did condemn the fruit, but not the tree which produced it.

We know that it may be objected here, that if the apostles' command to "masters," did virtually condemn the "relation" of which we have been speaking, then the same directions would condemn any kind of relation which might have existed between "servants" and their masters." But this objection amounts to nothing, as the reader will see at once, when he considers, that no other "relation" except the one in which our brethren contend, gave the master absolute power over his servant, and consequently no other "relation" gave him a "right" to do the things which are forbidden by the apostles.

3. There are one or two statements made by our brethren, with regard to the character of this "relation," when sustained by different persons, which we think deserve a passing notice. They charge us with "fallacy in arguing the morality of this question," because they say "we found" our reasonings "not upon the relation itself, nor upon what that relation would be in the hands of a truly Christian master, but upon extreme cases of licentious and cruel abuse of that relation in the hands of a tyrant." And again they say, that the apostle "exhibits the difference between slaveholding in the hands of a Christian master, and a tyrannical and heathen master." Does he? Indeed! Then a Christian may do that for which the apostle would condemn a heathen! But our brethren will say, probably, that this was not their meaning; they only meant that the heathen would be more likely to "abuse the relation;" the Christian would "actually perform the proper duties of his station." Granted; and if the Christian does exercise the duties of his station, we think he will certainly "let the oppressed go free;" at least he will cease to hold them as his property; and if the heathen should "be guilty of all the cruelties and abominations, of which Greek and Roman slavery was pre-eminently full," he would not abuse the "relation" for which these brethren contend, but he would do those things in the hands of a tyrant, which the rights, which this "relation" conferred upon him, would not allow him to do. In this conclusion, let our brethren have the goodness to detect it; till they do this, however, the reader must be the judge as to where the "fallacy" lies.

4. But we have before assigned a number of arguments, (see 6 and 9, in the Appeal,) which we think are perfectly conclusive, why neither Christ or his apostles ever specified the "relation" of a Christian master, and denounced it expressly as a sin against God; and which, we think, our brethren should not have passed over, in silence.

It is true, there is no express precept in the Bible in relation to many habits which prevail at this age among men; but these habits, nevertheless, are deemed sinful by all the real disciples of Christ; and in the same way we might prove that slave-holding is a sin, even though there were no explicit commands which could be brought to bear upon the subject.

Thus having proved, that no authority whatever can be fairly drawn from either the Old, or New Testaments in favor of American Slavery; a few remarks may now be added to what we have already said, concerning the "Scripture Argument" of our brethren.

1. In the course of their "Appeal," they tell us that the existence of the "relation between the Christian master and the slave, is right;" and speaking of some of the slaves who, in the days of the apostles, were "bought or sold," they say, "here, again, is a clear discrimination between the right relation of the relation in the hands of a Christian master, and its cruelties and iniquities in the hands of the heathen." Without stopping to inquire, what it is that makes it wrong for a sinner or heathen to hold the "relation" here spoken of, of more than it is for a Christian to do this, we would beg the reader's attention to the statement so distinctly made in the above quotation, as it is elsewhere in the "Counter Appeal," that the "relation is *right*;" slaveholding "in the hands of a Christian is *right*," but, our brethren tell us, "a sin," that "CHRISTIANITY" not only permits slaveholding, but in supposable circumstances, EXJOINS a CONTINUANCE of the master's authority!" And in their "critical canvassing" of one passage, they say again, "This text seems mainly to EXJOIN and SANCTION the fitting CONTINUANCE of their present social relations."

Now let the reader compare the following quotation with the above; it is one of the "results" to which our brethren tell us they are arrived, in concluding the "Argument." The letter of the golden rule and the spirit of the gospel, operate with an irresistible tendency, to the annihilation, diminution, and destruction of slavery, as a system, holding forth its continuance, by the authors of legislation, beyond the time of its practicable removal, a sin. With the qualifications, therefore, which we have above stated, we may affirm the proposition, that the Bible is opposed to slavery." A most singular "result," this, surely, for our brethren to arrive at, after having been telling us, that "CHRISTIANITY" not only permits slaveholding, but in supposable circumstances, EXJOINS a CONTINUANCE of the master's authority!" And in their "critical canvassing" of one passage, they say again, "This text seems mainly to EXJOIN and SANCTION the fitting CONTINUANCE of their present social relations."

2. Will our brethren tell us how it is, that "the spirit of the gospel operates, with an irresistible tendency, to destroy" a "relation" which it "permits" and "sanctions" as "right" in the sight of God? Nay, by the showing of the "Counter Appeal," the gospel, yes, Christian reader, the "spirit of the gospel," is the very thing which will perpetuate and continue the slave system as long as the world stands! How so? Why this "Appeal" tells us, that it is the gospel which makes the relation between master and slave, a "sin" in the sight of God; it moreover tells us that "Christianity not only permits, but in supposable circumstances, positively EXJOINS a CONTINUANCE of the master's authority!" Hence all slaveholders have only to embrace the gospel, and "Christianity not only permits," but it "sanctions" their authority over their slaves, and if they can make themselves believe that it will be the "less evil" of the two, they are commanded by the "golden rule," not to attempt a "remedy" of the system, but to pray for its continuance, and to do all in their power to perpetuate its existence as long as the world endures!

3. Again, these brethren tell us that one reason why the apostles did not, in their day, "preach emancipation," was because "masters would hardly have consented to claims founded on such authority, and slaves would have been tempted to embrace a religion which asserted their right to freedom." But our brethren in just so many words tell us, that they, themselves, now preach a gospel which, though it does not enjoin immediate emancipation upon the master, yet it holds out a strong temptation for him to embrace it, especially if he have any doubts as to the "right" of his "relation" to his slaves; for as soon as he embraces the gospel, that "relation" is "permitted," and "enjoined," as a "rightful existence." But alas! for the poor slaves; they have the greatest inducement to reject the gospel, for they must see at once, that though the moral sense of the whole world condemns their claims as unjust, yet, if they "embrace" the "spirit of the gospel," "CHRISTIANITY," and the "golden rule," "SANCTIONS" them, and if the master thinks best, EXJOINS their "CONTINUANCE," beyond the hope of freedom!

4. Once more. The reader will probably recollect, that we have already noted the place in the "Counter Appeal," where the authors of it say, that we had "conceded" as they thought, "the whole question" at issue. They thought so, it may be; but it so happens, that we never "conceded" it in any way; and we have done this very thing! Let the reader look at the following quotation, and then say who "concedes the whole question, and gives up the whole point at issue." It is one of the "results" to which the brethren tell us they have arrived in the management of their "Scripture Argument," and it reads as follows:—

"*Christianity, by proclaiming the immortal existence of every human soul, and pronouncing ALL EQUALLY RESPONSIBLE, EQUALLY CAPABLE, in the eye of God, to ATTEMPT THE STIGMA OF LIBERTY, as a absurdity upon the principle, that man can, in nature, be a mere article of property. WHATSOEVER, in the prevention of higher evils, RIGHTFULLY retain in transient existence, it does at the same time, attest the innate ascendancy of his nature, by which he must inevitably rise above this VICIOUS and UNNATURAL position of a mere chattel, into an elevation worthy his true character.*"

We ever any thing that is "unlike itself!" "Christianity may RIGHTFULLY RETAIN" a man, an immortal being, in SLAVERY,—it may, and it even does justify and sanction a "relation" which holds him as "a chattel personal, in the hands of his master and possessor, to ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER," and at the same time it "fixes a stigma" upon this "relation,"—"*an unnatural, a libellous, a blasphemous, a profane, and a sacrilegious relation*," which will not avail upon a contradiction which must be so evident to every reader, nor will we stop to press it, as we know we might do, to the disadvantage of our brethren; it is sufficient for the reader to see, that the "whole question" at issue, is conceded in the above quotation; the slave laws, as we have shown, establish the "relation" between the master and the slave, which makes the slave in the very spirit, design, and language of his law, "a chattel," a mere article of property.

"TO ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER," and upon the "principle that man can," in the nature of things, be such an article of property, the brethren who have signed the

"Counter Appeal," tell us in the above quotation, that "CHRISTIANITY STAMPS THE STIGMA OF AN UNNATURAL, PICTIOUS, AND LIBELLIOUS ABSURDITY!!!"

Alas! for our brethren! Little did they imagine when putting their names to the document which contains the above language, that they were signing the death warrant of every man, woman, and child, the most distant idea of which, that they were putting into their hands a "Scripture Argument," sure enough, and one by which they themselves, would enable us to demonstrate the sin of slaveholding beyond the possibility of their successful contradiction! And we beg the reader to take this unwary concession, together with the "Argument," of which it is set down as one of the "results," and lay them up in his memory, as an everlasting evidence how utterly inconsistent that "relation" is, with reason and religion, which even the best of men sometimes so unfortunately set themselves to defend!

From the view we have taken of this most singular argument, which our brethren have brought in favor of slaveholding, and from some of the "results" to which they arrive in its management, it only remains for us now to recapitulate the following particulars:

1. We have shown that our brethren stumble upon the very threshold of the subject, in failing to state the question correctly. We stated in our Appeal (1) that, to "hold property in man, is a crime;" but our brethren give a quotation from us, to make it appear as though we simply said, "the slave system is wrong." Our brethren were "wrong" in giving this view of the question, but it was not a "crime."

2. They stumble, again, in the first argument which they adduce upon the question at issue:—1. In taking it for granted, without proof, that when one man steals, or withholds the liberty of another, as in the case of slaveholding, it is no sin. 2. In taking it for granted, that when millions of men, women, and children, lose their liberty in this way, it is an evil which is brought upon them by the agency of God. 3. In taking it for granted, that if every slaveholder in this nation were to cease holding property in the human species, it would be attended with more sin than the continuance of the slave system. 4. In reasoning from a number of particulars, and inferring from the whole, what is true only of a part—as that, because a government may justly require the services of its subjects for the "general good" of society, it follows, that one man has a right to deprive another of his liberty, and hold him in hopeless and unending slavery. This is an error which is often committed in the course of the "scripture argument," as we doubt not our brethren themselves will see, upon a review of what they have written.

3. They commit themselves, again, in tacitly admitting that the slaves would be justified in rising and killing all their masters, if they thought that "they had a decisive moral certainty that such a revolution would not be less horrible in its effects, than the present endurance of their despotism." This "moral certainty" is the identical principle upon which Nat Turner acted, when he commenced the Southampton insurrection, a few years since.

Our brethren beg the question, again, when they reason from "the specific directions of the New Testament," in taking it for granted, that *doings* always signifies one who was the entire property of another; we have proved, that this is not the fact.

5. Granting the premises in this case, the argument in the "Counter Appeal," proves too much; it proves, that the apostles justified, approved, and "sanctioned" a "relation," which authorized every "master" to commit theft, adultery, and murder; and the reader must see, that if the apostles did "sanction" such a "relation" as this, it follows as an undeniable consequence, that they did, also, "sanction" every part of which it was composed, and all and singular, the "rights" which it conferred upon the master who held it.

6. But we have proved, that the very "specific texts" which our brethren adduce in favor of the "right" of one man to hold property in another, afford the most conclusive evidence that could be desired, that the apostles did not "sanction" such a "relation," inasmuch as they condemned the "rights," or the very things which it gave every slaveholder a right to do. Those Romans, who held slaves in that "relation" for which our brethren contend, had a "right," in virtue of the "relation," not only "to box" them or "to cuff" them "on the ear," but they were authorized and empowered by this "relation" to torture them, to maim them, and to put them to death in any way they chose, and according to Dr. Taylor's "Elements of Civil Law," those slaves could not be insured in any way. And a "relation," which authorized and justified such cruelties, such horrible, and we may add, diabolical injustice as all this, some eight or ten Methodist preachers, tell us, is "sanctioned by the holy apostles," and justified by the testimony of the infinite God! O tempora! tempora!

7. Our brethren make a most singular distinction as to the nature of the "relation," when held in the hands of different persons; hence they say, that there "is a clear discrimination between the righteous existence of the relation in the hands of a Christian master, and its cruelties and iniquities in the hands of the froward;" and, accordingly, they charge us with "fallacy," because they think that we, and others, have not founded our reasoning upon this "relation itself," thus distinguished, "but upon extreme cases of licentious and cruel abuse of that relation in the hands of a tyrant."

Now, Christian reader, what say you? Have we even mentioned one single instance of the "abuse of this relation" in the whole course of our remarks? Not we! We deny this charge; and we say that we have confined our arguments to this "relation itself," and to this alone; and we now leave it to our readers to judge whether we have not proved, even by the "scripture argument," of our brethren, that this relation is *natum in se*, just as really as the crimes are, which it authorized and empowered those to commit who held it. This "relation" empowered and authorized the master to commit theft, adultery, injustice of every kind, and murder, as well as "boxing and cuffing" the slaves "on the ear." Now, could the apostles forbid these things under the penalties of God's displeasure, and yet justify and "sanction the relation" which authorized them?

We say, No! Our brethren say, Yes!

8. Our brethren contend, that this "relation in the hands of a Christian master is right," because such masters would not, or could not, "abuse" it. But we have shown that, in the days of the apostles, it was not, in any way, possible for slaveholders to abuse it. Nor can any Christian slaveholder in this nation, scarcely abuse this relation, except it be in the commission of murder; and he may even do this, if the slave, male or female, resist him in any thing. We have shown that, at his pleasure, he may yoke them with iron collars; he may compel them to work fifteen hours a day with chains upon their limbs; he may incarcerate them in a prison for life, without even the form of a trial; he may take all the fruit of their labor; he may violate female chastity; he may annihilate the family state, and part those sunder whom God has joined together; he may arrogate the moral government of God over his slaves; he may—may, he must, and he does, withhold from them the Holy Scriptures, which heaven intended as a gift to every human soul; and he may—he must, and he does, withhold from them "all mental" instruction in letters, under the penalties of fine, imprisonment, and death upon the galleys. All these things he may do, and some of them he must do, and in doing them he does not abuse the "relation," which, we are told, the apostles permitted and "sanctioned," but he fulfills that "relation,"—namely, more, he abuses the relation when he leaves them undone!

9. Though our brethren have given us a labored "scripture argument," to prove that the "relation" now under notice, was, and is "right" in the sight of God; and though they tell us, repeatedly, that it was justified and "sanctioned by the apostles," yet they finally come to the conclusion that the "Bible is opposed" to it! But how, we would ask,—how can the Bible be "opposed" to that which the Bible says is "right"? If slaveholding is now, under all circumstances of the case, it will—under all the "circumstances of the case,"—be right to-morrow, it will be right next year, and "Counter Appeals" (not apologies,—our brethren do not like to be called "apologists for slavery") may be issued and sent far and wide through the country to show that it is a "RIGHTFUL EXISTENCE," and that the apostles "SANCTIONED" it, and so we shall have bonds, and chains, and SLAVERY FOREVER!!

10. But, omitting many other singular things which might be said, in relation to the "scripture argument" of our brethren, we close this recapitulation by simply referring to the unwary concession which this "Counter Appeal" makes of the whole question at issue! "Upon the principle that man can, in nature, be a mere article of property, Christianity stamps the stigma of a felonious, unnatural, and libellous absurdity!"

Thus ends this "specimen of" a "scripture argument," and here, also, shall end our remarks concerning it.

With the reader's permission, we will now proceed to show, more fully, wherein—

THE BIBLE CONDEMNES THE SYSTEM OF SLAVEHOLDING, AND MAKES IT APPEAR, AS IT CERTAINLY IS, A SIN AGAINST GOD.

We have, already, expressed some of our views, (see Appeal, 11) as to the attempts which many good people have been led to make, in order to press the Holy Scriptures into a justification of slavery; but it is pretty certain, that our brethren, whose names are affixed to the "Counter Appeal," do not think as we do upon this subject; had they done so, we should not feel ourselves

laid under the necessity of adding any thing more upon the question at issue; and we hope the Christian reader will believe us when we say, that this is a most painful necessity! How can it be otherwise? The labor we have to perform is nothing more or less than this:—to convince believers in the Bible, Christians, and Christian ministers, that the Bible does really condemn all sorts of injustice; that it does positively forbid all sorts of theft, and all kinds of uncleanness, and all kinds of fraud, and all kinds of oppression. It is to convince them, that the Holy Scriptures do really enjoin upon all men the exercise of that kindness and pity, and love, and good-will toward men, which are designed by the great and good Being to prevent man from enslaving his fellow-man. And we most candidly confess, that, to us, it is a melancholy and mortifying reflection, that a necessity like this should be put upon us,—of proving a question which was declared to be a "SELF-EVIDENT" fact more than fifty years ago, by the assembled wisdom and intelligence of this whole nation! Nay, a fact, the truth of which, is attested by our political existence as a people, a fact which is set forth and declared in the Bills of Rights, and in the constitutions of about every State in this Union, and one which has been believed and taught by the wisest and best of men who have ever lived,—and one which is attested and confirmed by the unperverted moral sense of the whole world of mankind! But so it is! And hence we cannot help saying, that we come to the performance of the duty which this necessity imposes upon us, with a humbling view of ourselves, as we must and we trust we do feel how liable we, ourselves, are to err and fall into the same, or similar, inconsistencies, which we have seen in our dearest and most respected brethren are now involved. We can appeal to the Searcher of hearts and say, that we love these brethren! We respect them, and we would do every thing in our power to honor them for their works' sake; but how can we yield to them when, through the force of circumstances, they are led to tell us that the Bible justifies slavery; that a "relation" between the enslaver and the enslaved, which authorizes the crimes of robbery, injustice, fraud, and a thousand other abominations, is permitted, justified, and sanctioned by the apostles of our God! O, dear brethren! how can we believe this! How can we, as men, as Christians, and as Christian ministers, yield our influence for one moment to perpetuate such a thought? Nay, dear brethren, as we love you, as we love the souls of our fellow-men, and as we fear God, we cannot—we cannot do this! And now, in addition to what we have already said, we beg leave still further to assign the following reasons. We observe them—

1. That slaveholding is forbidden in the 8th commandment, which says, THOU SHALT NOT STEAL! This commandment would, certainly, have prevented all slaveholding among the Jews, as mild as the system was among them, had it not been for the express permission of God; just the same as the commandment which says, Thou shalt not kill, would have prevented the nearest of kin from killing the murderer of his friend, if it had not been for God's direction and permission in the case. Hence it follows, conclusively, that every human being who has been enslaved by the people of this nation, has been made a slave in direct violation of this commandment, and also, that all such as are now retained in slavery, are retained in this condition, in violation of the Divine injunction, which says, THOU SHALT NOT STEAL! This consequence, we say, must, of necessity, follow—unless it can be shown, that God has imparted His express permission to the people of this nation to enslave their species; but, we suppose, this will hardly be pretended by any one. Deity never gave any part of this nation, soul, that the laws make the slaves; that it must be right for one man to enslave another, because it is according to law. But who made those laws, by which one-sixth part of this nation are enslaved? Why, the slaveholders, to be sure! And where has God given to any man, or community of men, the right to make laws which contravene His LAW? The fact is, men have no such right; they never did have; and such a right they never can have. And, hence, even if the Deity had ever given any part of this nation, soul, to enslave some of their species, it would be inconsistent for any of them to do so, till the nation had revoked its Declaration of Independence; for this is the Great Charter upon which all the State rights are founded; and this declares, before heaven and earth, "that ALL MEN are created EQUAL," and "that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain UNALIENABLE RIGHTS"—such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, a nation which declares, expressly, that the very same thing, of which we are now speaking, when committed upon the high seas, or on the African coast, is PIRACY, and punishable with DEATH! But here, in this nation, we have about sixty thousand human beings enslaved every year; and many of them, by Christians and professed ministers of the gospel—reduced to involuntary and hopeless bondage! Those who are now held in slavery by the laws of this nation, are born slaves; that no human being can be a slave, in the sense in which we now use this term, we have already proved by a quotation from Blackstone, (see Appeal, 25). And if we say, that some in this nation are, and must be, born slaves, because of the laws which authorize the enslavers to reduce them to this state, then it follows, that the Declaration of Independence referred to above, is false, and no State, which has come into existence by virtue of the act set forth in this instrument, has a right to pass the laws which have given one man such power over another.

But, let us suppose one case out of thousands which actually exist, at this time, among the people of this land. Here is a man, who has thirty slaves in his possession; and they were "born in his house;" they never were owned by any other "master;" but their liberty is gone! Who has got their liberty? Who took it away from them? Who withholds it from them? Were they ever paid for the liberty which their "master" has taken away from them? No! Did they give it to him? No! Have they sold it to him? No! But how, then, came they destitute of liberty to read God's word? Liberty—to think for themselves? Liberty—to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences? Liberty—to obey God in taking care of their wives and families? Liberty—to educate their children? Liberty—to defend the chastity of their own persons? Liberty—to enjoy the fruits of their own labor? Liberty—to be free from the control of their masters? Liberty—to be free from the control of their masters? Liberty—to do all these things, which the act by which it has been taken from them is felony against God! It is fraud; it is theft; it is a direct violation of the command which says, THOU SHALT NOT STEAL!

This man, who has usurped the liberty of these souls, it will be granted, we suppose, is an "enslaver," according to Webster's Dictionary; and he is also a professed Christian; and he can assign this very conclusive reason for stealing the liberty of thirty of God's intelligent creatures, namely,—if he had not done it, some other person would—"some froward" or wicked man, perhaps! And how very desirable it must be, according to the reasoning of such men, that all the gambling, and all the traffic in ardent spirits, as well as the use of them, and all the thieving and other crimes, should be done by Christians—by respectable men—because if they do not do these things, some others, less Christian than themselves, will do them!

We will suppose these thirty slaves are sold to a second person. Is the person's title to their liberty, who buys them, any better than his who sells them? He buys them, knowing, as every man in this nation knows, that these slaves have been unjustly deprived of their liberty; he knows that he pays them nothing for the loss of it—and he knows that their liberty is a boon which they could not sell if they would; and he knows, further, that no equivalent has been, or ever can be given to them for it. And yet he buys them, and continues the crime which the seller first began; and he begins the crime in relation to all their children who are born, while they are in his hands. Hence, we say, in view of the premises which we have stated,—if these men, and all such men who possess the liberty of their species in this way, and hold them as their property, do not, as really and as criminally, violate the above commandment of God, as the man who sells them to do, then we confess ourself utterly unable to tell what constitutes a violation of this commandment.

2. All slaveholding is forbidden in the 9th commandment, which says, THOU SHALT NOT COVET ANY THING THAT IS THY NEIGHBOR'S. He who holds his fellow-men in bondage as his property, violates this commandment, because he does certainly covet some things, which, of right, do, and in the nature of the case, must belong to his neighbors, and withholds it from him; he covets his neighbor's services, and compels him to work without wages; he covets his neighbor's wife, and frequently takes her from her husband, and sells her into the hands of another by whom she is parted from her husband forever; he covets his neighbor's children, and hence he enslaves them, and sometimes sells them and tears them from the bosom of their parents. The application of this commandment to the question at issue, cannot be made unless it be shown, that a certain part of the human family are not our "neighbors;" this however we do not believe that any Christian will ever attempt to do, and, hence, we will rest our argument upon this passage as perfectly conclusive. And two out of ten commandments, ought, we should suppose, to satisfy any believer in the Bible, as to the sin of holding property in man.

3. All those passages in the Bible are against the Slave-system, which forbid MANSTEALING expressly. Two of these passages were introduced into the Appeal, (see 3 and 4) but our brethren, it seems, found it not convenient to dispute the arguments which we

drew from them, and we are left to conjecture the reason why they did not. But we will now add one or two more to them, as we desire to convince the Christian reader, that the word of God is not a dead letter in relation to one of the greatest evils that ever disgraced humanity.

4. The law was made for the disobedient—for murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers—for whoremongers—for MEXTEALERS. 1. Tim. i. 9. The law here referred to, we have quoted in the Appeal, (3, 4) and we stated there, and we repeat it, that every human being in this land, who is now held by another as his property, has been stolen by another; and it is evident, not only from what we know takes place every day in this country, but also from the express testimony of God which is given in the Bible against this crime. But what constitutes man-steal? We answer, the taking and holding of property in man. Every intelligent being born into the world, possesses by virtue of his existence, the right of personal security, the right of personal liberty, and the right of private property; and of these rights, every one is undeniably possessed, and no man can be deprived of them by the will of his Creator; with these rights, is proved not only by the moral government of God, and the unperverted reason of mankind, but also from the fact that men constitute society, and establish forms of government in the exercise of them; for if men do not, by virtue of their existence, possess these rights, before they form society, then it follows, that society can possess no rights of any kind after it is formed, for it is intuitively evident, that men cannot give rights to society, if the society do not possess those which we have named, as inherent and unalienable. Hence we believe the reader will find it impossible to suppose a case of man-steal, which ever was, or ever can be committed, if it is not a fact, that every enslaved human being in this nation presents a case of this crime. Let him try it, and see to what conclusions any supposable case will carry him.

5. The Scriptures forbid slaveholding in all those places where they prohibit the sale of man-steal. There are many in the Bible of this kind; take the following as examples:

Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren or of thy strangers;—at his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it; for he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it; lest he cry against thee unto the Lord, and it be sin unto thee. Deut. xiv. 14. Every man commits the sin described in this passage, who keeps back an equivalent for the labor of those whom he employs to do his work for him. Hear God again in another place: I saw this fact that I have chosen? To lose the hands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Isa. lviii. 6; and see also the whole of this chapter.

The slaves of this land are OPPRESSED, in their persons, by the cruelties which they suffer, and in having the fruit of their labor taken away without their consent, and never were any class of men oppressed with more injustice and less mercy, than they now are; and God says to their masters, LET THEM GO FREE! He commands us, also, to aid in their deliverance: Thus saith the Lord, execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the OPPRESSED, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn, that none can quench it. Jer. xxi. 12.

If the following passage does not forbid slaveholding, then we have yet to learn what sin is forbidden in the Bible:—Woe unto him that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work. Jer. xlii. 13. Every slaveholder in this land uses the service of his neighbor without wages, and every body knows that when servants are held as property, they are not paid for their work; and reader, it is the great God, who says to their masters: Behold the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of sabaoth. James v. 4.

6. The slave system is condemned in all those passages which forbid TRADING IN THE PERSONS OF MEN. The following passages condemn the slave trade, and every body knows that the children also of Judah, and the children of Jerusalem have yoked unto the Grecians;—behold, I will return you RECOMPENSE upon your own head. Joel iii. 6. "Thus saith the Lord, For three transgressions of Israel, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof: because they sold the righteous for silver and the poor for a pair of shoes." Amos ii. 5. "Thus saith the Lord my God: Feed the flock of the slaughter, whose possessors say they, and hold the sword over sinners, and slay the righteous; and they say, We will not see the Lord for I am rich; and their own shepherds pity them not." Zec. xi. 4. "Against this peremptory and comprehensive scheme of unchristianizing," which is displayed in the foregoing passages, we are perfectly willing our brethren should publish their "protest," if they please, and state their "radical objections." We have many other passages of the very same kind, which we will produce, when these shall have been well digested and disposed of.

7. All those passages in the Bible, which enjoin upon man the exercise of pity, kindness, and compassion, condemn the system of slavery. These are an innumerable to be quoted here. One we may give, however, as an example:—And if thy brother be waxen poor, and falleth in decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him:—and if thy brother be waxen poor and be sold unto thee, then thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond servant." Lev. xix. 35.

8. The spirit and design of the gospel is against this system. All slaveholders have it in their power—and many, if not most of them, do prevent the fulfilling of Christ's last command to his disciples, that his gospel should be preached to every creature. Volumes might be filled with testimonies from slave-owners themselves, to demonstrate this fact. Take the following in evidence. It is from a sermon preached before two associations of planters in Georgia, in 1831, by Rev. W. C. Jones. "Generally speaking, the slaves appear to us to be without God and without hope in the world, a nation of heathen in our very midst. We cannot cry out against the Papists for withholding the Scriptures from the common people, and keeping them in ignorance of the way of life; for we withhold the Bible from our servants and keep them in ignorance of it, while we will not use the means to have it read and explained to them. The cry of our perishing servants comes up to us from the midst of their ignorance, and superstition, and adultery, and lewdness."

The Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, declare as follows:—"Who would credit it, that in these years of revivals and benevolent efforts, in this Christian republic, there are over two millions of human beings in the condition of heathens, and in some respects in a worse condition. From long continued and close observation, we believe that their moral and religious condition is such, that they may justly be considered the heathen of this Christian country, and will bear a comparison with the heathen of any country in the world. The negroes are destitute of the GOSPEL, and EVER WILL BE UNDER THE PRESENT STATE OF THINGS." Such, Christian reader, with a few exceptions we grant, such is the moral condition of millions in this land, who are thus debased, ignorant and wretched, and debarr'd from reading the word of God, by that "relation" which many good people would have us believe is "sanctioned" by the Holy Scriptures! Think on the condition of these heathen, and remember, that every one of their masters holds in his hands the TREMENDOUS POWER of keeping them in this condition, and of SHUTTING OUT FROM THEIR SIGHT THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, and the vast concerns of an ETERNAL WORLD! We remark again:—

9. The conditions of forgiveness and salvation are utterly irreconcilable with holding property in man. What else can be the meaning of these few words, "Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Mat. v. 23. Let those who dispute us here, show, that the poor slave has nothing against his brother, (Christian or Minister as he may profess to be), who withholds from him his liberty, keeps him in ignorance, takes the fruit of his labor, and furnishes him with no food? Hence he is nothing against him? Nothing against him who robs him of his liberty? Nothing against him who takes away his wife? Nothing against him who steals his children and sells them into hopeless bondage? Nothing against him who takes all the fruit of his unrequited labor? Nothing against him who crushes his mind with ignorance, and debars him from searching the word of God? Then, indeed, are the scriptures without sin, and it is impossible to prove by them, that the God of truth and justice has any thing against any sinner who lives upon the face of the earth!

We might go on to quote no inconsiderable part of the Bible, but we forbear; we believe that the foregoing are to the point, and directly to the point at issue between us and our brethren; and, Christian reader, we bespeak for them a candid and prayerful reading, before you yield your assent to that doctrine which says that the Bible does not condemn a relation which withholds the Bible from millions of your species,—a relation which crushes the intellects of God's intelligent creatures, and reduces them to wretchedness and vice in this world, and carries them down to unending despair in the world to come!

We have now to observe that—

THE GENERAL RULE IN THE DISCIPLINE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, IS OPPOSED TO SLAVEHOLDING.

This we think we have already shown (see Appeal 12) but the

remarks of our brethren make it necessary for us to add a few words on this subject.

1. The "Counter Appeal" informs us, that the only design of our General Rule was, to forbid the slave trade." But if our brethren are correct in this explanation, then it follows, that the members of our Church may STEAL, as many human beings as they please, and make slaves of them, for if they neither "buy" or "sell" them, they do not contravene any rule in our Discipline against slavery!

2. They tell us again, that our General Rule was not designed to prevent, and that it does not actually forbid, "even every case of internal slave trade," in other words, that it simply forbids the "reducing of those to slavery," by "buying or selling" them, who were before free. But we would inquire, how any one can possibly be reduced to slavery by his being bought or sold merely, who was not a slave before? Is it not perfectly evident to any one who reflects upon the subject for one moment, that no one can be bought or sold, till after he is reduced to slavery? So it must follow according to this "critical canvassing" of our Rule, that the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church may "enslave men, women, and children," by scores, and even hundreds, but if they do not "buy" or "sell" them, till they are actually reduced to slavery, (a thing which, in the very nature of the case, cannot be done) they contravene no rule in our excellent form of Discipline! They may kidnap human beings and make slaves of them, or they may buy those whom they know have been kidnapped and enslaved, and our general rule, which forbids the "intention" of slavery, cannot be brought to bear against them! The Methodist who can receive these sayings, let him receive them!

3. We do not pretend to have a better understanding than others as to what the real design of this rule was, when it was first added to the number of our General Rules; but we suppose that it was designed, as far as possible, to PREVENT slaveholding and slavery in our Church, precisely the same as each of the other rules were designed to prevent the crimes that are mentioned in them. We have a rule against profane swearing, and we believe that it was designed to prevent this crime in all its forms, and every thing which leads to it; we have another against Sabbath-breaking, and we suppose it was designed to prevent this crime in all its forms as well as every thing which leads to it; and so of the general rule against "enslaving men, women, and children." If this rule was not designed to prevent SLAVERY in the Church, what was it designed for? To say that it was "simply designed to prevent some cases of the internal slave trade," or in other words, that it was designed simply to prevent our members from making slaves of men by buying or selling them, is to say, that it was designed to prevent what we believe never did and never can take place. "Men, women, and children," are not reduced to slavery by being bought or sold simply, but they are bought and sold, because they have been before reduced to this state.

Hence, we think the fact, that our General Rule prohibits the "intention" of enslaving the human species, leaves no room to doubt but that it was designed to prevent the existence of the "great evil" in the Church. Suppose, for instance, a member of the church steals "men, women, or children," with the "intention" of enslaving them, does he not contravene our Rule? Is not the "intention" in this case as criminal as though he bought them with such a design? Or suppose he receive them as a gift from a third person, with the "intention to enslave them?" Does the manner of his coming into the possession of them, alter the nature of an intention to enslave them? We think not; nor can we conceive how, in the nature of things, it can be right for one man to continue a thing which it was a crime in another to begin. If it is a crime for one man to make a slave of his fellow man, the conclusion is irresistible, that it is no less so for another to continue him in this state.

4. The remarks, which our brethren have given us on the word "enslaver," we hope, are not to be taken as a "specimen" of their skill in English lexicography; though they may still persist in thinking that a man who holds fifty of his species in slavery, and makes slaves of all the children of such, is not an "enslaver" according to Mr. Webster. These fifty persons are enslaved, are they not? And who enslaves them? Why, the man who *undeprives* them of their liberty, to be sure. Well, and is he not an "enslaver"? We think he is, just as really an "enslaver," as any other person that could be named.

5. The "Counter Appeal" makes an attempt to show that those preachers of our Church, who abrogated some rules which were against slavery in our Discipline, were at the same time as much *convinced* as the *slaveholders* were, that the slave trade was a crime; and that they were not at all *convinced* that the slave trade was a crime. We have no more belief in this, than we do that our Rule against the use of spirituous liquors could now be banished entirely from the Discipline, by those who are as much in favor of the temperance reformation, and opposed to intemperance, as Wesley was. There are the rules, (see Appeal, 18, 19), and the fact that they have long since been left out of the Discipline, will speak for itself. We have our fears as to the true reasons for this "Counter Appeal," and the "Counter Appeal" of our brethren has but confirmed them. They tell us that the General Conference was "convinced as much as ever, that the whole fabric of slavery was an evil;" yet they themselves, think that some "parts of the system" are "just and humane," so much so that the Discipline never was designed to PREVENT its existence in the Church! From this showing of our brethren, it seems but too evident that they do not think as the great body of Methodist preachers did, upon this subject, fifty years ago!

The sentiments of Wesley, and Dr. Clarke, at the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in England, the reader will have seen in the Appeal, and we do not wonder that our brethren, in concluding their remarks, should start back a little, when they found themselves so very wide from the course pursued by Wesley and his successors in England. Among many other wholesome truths which they read in the extracts we have given, was the following testimony of the whole Conference of Wesleyan Ministers, against the very principles advocated in the "Counter Appeal," and the course which its authors have taken in sending it out to the world:—"That the Conference fully concur in those strong moral views of the EVIL of slavery which are taken by their fellow Christians of different denominations—and that they express in this manner [by petitions to parliament] their sympathy with an injured portion of their race, and their ABHORRENCE OF ALL THOSE PRINCIPLES OF WHICH IT IS ATTEMPTED TO DEFEND THE SUBJECTION OF HUMAN BEINGS TO HOPELESS AND UNREDEEMABLE SLAVERY."

No wonder that this "Counter Appeal" winds up with an attempt to make the reader believe that our extracts from Wesley, Clarke, and Watson, favored the views of those who put their names to it! But mark you, good reader, the "Counter Appeal" gives us no extracts from either Wesley, or Dr. Clarke, nor from Watson, nor indeed from any other Methodist writer, in favor of the "relation" for which our brethren argue; they can quote from no "Counter Appeals" published in England. No! not a book, nor a tract, nor a sermon, nor an "extra" paper of any kind, was ever published by Methodist preachers in England in favor of the "rightful existence" of slavery, nor against the feeblest efforts of those who undertook to enlist the prayers and Christian efforts of their brethren for the purpose of opposing it!

Concerning the measures which have been taken by many good people to prevent us in the discharge of what we believe to be our solemn duty in relation to the sin of slaveholding and its remedy, we did design to add a few remarks in the next part of the paper, but of room compels us to submit the question without them. Had the paper upon which we have been remarking, expressed any sympathy for the millions in this land who are in bonds, had it responded to our request, that prayer should be made to God for them,—had it even hinted, for our encouragement, to any Christian action which ought to be brought to bear against the GREAT EVIL of slavery, less painful, indeed, would have been the duty which we have now striven to perform. It is true, this paper does seem to change its voice, almost in the very last paragraph, as from regret for what it had said before,—it calls upon the members of our Church, who live at the South, "to emulate the memorable stand of our brethren in England," and "take the lead in the work of universal emancipation!" And suppose our good brethren at the South were to comply with this invocation, and express, as "our brethren in England" have done, "their utter ABHORRENCE OF ALL THOSE PRINCIPLES OF WHICH IT IS ATTEMPTED TO DEFEND THE SUBJECTION OF HUMAN BEINGS TO HOPELESS AND UNREDEEMABLE SLAVERY," and the "subjection of human beings to the rightful existence" of slavery? What then! Would the signers of this "Counter" be found among the number of those "who, with the name of Wesley upon their banners, and his spirit in their hearts, would be leading on the foremost van?" Or, would they be too busily engaged in writing "Counter Appeals," for the purpose of declaring their "disdain" and "entering their protest" against a few of their brethren, who had been praying for the delivery of the world of JERUSALEM, and using their humble efforts to bring on the work of "UNIVERSAL EMANCIPATION?"

S. W. WILSON,
LA ROY SUNDERLAND,
GEORGE STOKES,
A. D. MERRILL,
JARED PERKINS.

April 22, 1835.

The preceding articles are printed in a pamphlet form, and may be had of DAVID H. ELA, No. 19, Washington Street, Boston, at \$4.50 per hundred.



Published

Vol. VI. No. 20.

ZION'S HERALD

Office No. 19 Washington

BENJ. KINGSBURY, JR.,

ASSISTED BY AN ASSOCIATION OF

David H. Ela, Print

FOR ZION'S HERALD

THE SABBATH

NO. III.

Remember the Sabbath day, to

Mr. EDITOR—In my last number

you some ministers of the gospel,

adoxical it may seem, habitually

Sabbath. Were it necessary, I

column of quotations, in demon

is too obvious to need further pro

number, I shall consider this sub

church members. How many of

gardens and fields on Sabbath m

little here, pulling a weed there,

ments for ploughing, planting, and

and selling, talking about the cattle,

How many more travel for pleasure